

Steven C. Vondran, [SBN 232337]
THE LAW OFFICES OF STEVEN C. VONDTRAN, PC
620 Newport Center Drive, Suite 1100
Newport Beach, California 92660
Telephone: (877) 276-5084
steve@vondranlegal.com

Attorney for IP ADDRESS 172.251.32.212

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

STRIKE 3 HOLDINGS, LLC.

No. 2:23-cv-10786-TJH-SP

Plaintiff.

vs.

John Doe subscriber assigned IP address 172.251.32.212

ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES TO FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

Defendants

John Defendant IP address 172.251.32.212 ("Defendant") hereby submits this Answer to the first amended complaint filed by STRIKE 3 HOLDINGS, LLC. In response to the Complaint, defendants answer as follows:

1. Denied
 2. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the allegations in Paragraph 2.
 3. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the allegations in Paragraph 3.
 4. Denied
 5. Denied

1 6. Denied

2 7. Admit

3 8. Admit

5 9. Defendant admits to personal jurisdiction of this court, but denies
6 infringement and lacks sufficient knowledge as to the remaining
7 allegations, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 9 and
8 denies liability for copyright infringement.

10 10. Defendant admits venue is proper.

11 11. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the
12 allegations in Paragraph 11.

13 12. Admit.

14 13. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge following reasonable inquiry and on
15 that basis denies the allegations in Paragraph 13.

16 14. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge as to awards won and on that basis
17 denies the allegations in paragraph 14.

18 15. Defendant denies Plaintiff's pornographic movies have a positive global
19 impact on society or the industry.

20 16. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the
21 allegation in paragraph 16.

22 17. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the
23 allegation in paragraph 17.

18. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the allegation in paragraph 18.

19. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the allegation in paragraph 19.

20. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the allegation in paragraph 20.

21. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the allegation in paragraph 21.

22. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the allegation in paragraph 22.

23. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the allegation in paragraph 23.

24. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the allegations in Paragraph 24.

25. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the allegation in paragraph 25

26. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the allegation in paragraph 26

27. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the allegation in paragraph 27.

28 Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the

1 allegation in paragraph 28.

2 29.Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the
3 allegation in paragraph 29.
4

5 30.Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the
6 allegation in paragraph 30.
7

8 31.Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge following reasonable inquiry and on
9 that basis denies the allegations in Paragraph 31.
10

11 32.Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge following and on that basis denies
12 the allegations in Paragraph 32.
13

14 33.Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the
15 allegation in paragraph 33.
16

17 34.Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the
18 allegations in Paragraph 34.
19

20 35.Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the
21 allegations in Paragraph 35.
22

23 36.Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the
24 allegation in paragraph 36.
25

26 37.Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the
27 allegation in paragraph 37.
28

38.Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the
allegations in Paragraph 38.

39. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the allegations in Paragraph 39.

40. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the allegations in Paragraph 40.

41. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge following reasonable inquiry and on that basis denies the allegations in Paragraph 41.

42. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge following reasonable inquiry and on that basis denies the allegations in Paragraph 42.

43.Denied

44.Denied

45. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the allegations in Paragraph 45.

46. Admit Plaintiff is seeking damages, but deny they are entitled to such.

47. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the allegations in Paragraph 47.

48. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the allegations in Paragraph 48

49. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the allegations in Paragraph 49

50. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the allegations in Paragraph 50.

51. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the allegations in Paragraph 51.

52. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the allegations in Paragraph 52.

53. Admit

54. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the allegations in Paragraph 54.

55. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the allegations in Paragraph 55 and denies infringement.

56. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the allegations in Paragraph 56.

57. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the allegations in Paragraph 57.

58. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the allegations in Paragraph 58.

59. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the allegations in Paragraph 59.

60 Denied

61. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the allegations in Paragraph 61

62 Admit (a) and (b)

63. Admit (a) through (e)

64.N/A

65. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the allegations in Paragraph 65.

66.Denied

67. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge and on that basis denies the allegations in Paragraph 67.

68.Deny (A) through (D)

69. Deny that Plaintiff is entitled to any relief requested in (A) through (F)

PRAAYER FOR RELIEF – Defendant denies liability and denies that Plaintiff is entitled to any relief including all requests made in paragraph 73 (A)-(F).

Further, Defendant asserts the following affirmative defenses:

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Failure to Mitigate Damages)

1. Plaintiff failed to mitigate the damages alleged in the Complaint.

Defendant alleges that Strike 3 Holdings learns of infringements and instead of taking immediate action to prevent further alleged infringements, it lets them pile up so they can reach at least a movie count of 20 or more. This is a continuing threat as they are on information and belief, able to continue monitoring the alleged infringing IP address from the date of the first downloaded movie. The plan is to rack up damages, not to prevent them.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Consent)

2. Defendants are informed and believe and thereon allege that plaintiff authorizes and consents to their movies being downloaded and shared by others as they are routinely offered for FREE on various porn tube sites and as such, they understand that people will share their clips on a BitTorrent application and by their actions consent to this.

WHEREFORE, Defendants pray for judgment as follows:

9 1. For judgment in favor of defendants and against plaintiff, dismissing
10 plaintiff's Complaint with prejudice;

11 || 2. For all costs incurred herein;

12 3. For attorney's fees when Plaintiff dismisses their case (and declaratory
13 judgment that Defendant was a *non-infringer* and the *prevailing party* to the
14 copyright action);

15 4. For such further relief as the Court in its discretion deems just,
16 equitable and proper.

17 || 5. Defendant requests a bench trial.

18

19 | RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

20 | DATED this 10th day of July, 2024.

21 THE LAW OFFICES OF STEVEN VONDTRAN,
P.C.

23

24

25

26

25

By /s/ Steve Vondran

Steven C. Vondran, Esq.

Attorneys for IP 172.251.32.212

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

ORIGINAL of the foregoing *e-filed* this
10th day of July 2024, to all registered ECF users:

Law Offices of Lincoln Bandlow, P.C.
1801 Century Park E. Suite 2400
Los Angeles, California 90067
Attn: Lincoln Dee Bandlow, Esq.
Email: lincoln@bandlowlaw.com

I declare the foregoing to be true and correct under the laws of perjury of the
United States of America. Executed on July 10th, 2024, at Flagstaff, AZ

By: /s/ *Lisa Vondran*

Lisa Vondran, Assistant